



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

thinks it safe and prudent. Our readers will, perhaps, remember the various decrees which the present Pope has published within the last few years, annulling, by his apostolic authority, laws made by the temporal governments in Spain, Switzerland, Sardinia, Mexico, New Granada, &c., &c.

And no Pope since the time of Boniface has ever disclaimed this power or condemned this law. Indeed, that could hardly be expected; for it is an awkward thing for one infallible Pope to contradict another infallible Pope in such matters. For it is to be observed that Pope Boniface VIII., in the above decree, was not merely making a law of his own, but was laying down what he believed to be the law of God, contained in the Gospel. He was expounding the words of Jesus Christ, as he judged it necessary for salvation that those words should be understood. If Pope Boniface were not infallible in this, then no Pope can have any claim to be infallible in anything. So the decree of Pope Boniface, once given, must stand for ever; once in the canon law it can never be put out of it. And, indeed, to do justice to Pope Pius IX., he seems to have little desire of putting it out.

The question for Roman Catholics in Ireland to consider is this, whether they would wish to see the canon law in this matter established in Ireland; which it certainly would be, if a Protestant government did not stand in the way.

We think every one must admit that if the Pope be indeed the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, and infallible in morals as well as in faith, it would be a blessed thing for the world that all temporal governments should be subject to the authority of the Pope.

The Pope has certainly a great opportunity of showing, in the city of Rome itself, the advantage of temporal government being subject to spiritual authority. It is a sad thing that the Romans do not seem to feel this advantage. The presence of an army of French bayonets in Rome for the last eight years, to keep the Romans in subjection to the Pope's temporal government, has a great tendency to prevent the world believing in Pope Boniface VIII., or in Pope Pius IX. either.

III. FREEDOM OF DISCUSSION.

Of course the two swords worked together to suppress freedom of discussion or opinion:—

"We also prohibit, that it shall not be lawful for any lay person to dispute, publicly or privately, concerning the Catholic faith. Whoever shall have done against this, let him be bound with the halter of excommunication."^{*}

This is only the *spiritual* sword; but the following passage shows how cleverly the two swords are made to help one another in the canon law, for the suppression of freedom of opinion:—

"By the advice of our brethren, we decree that the goods of heretics, who sin more heavily, horribly, and detestably than the aforesaid (incestuous persons, &c.), are confiscated by the same right. But execution of confiscation of this kind, or the seizing of their goods, ought not to be made by princes or other temporal lords, according to the declaration of our predecessor, Pope Gregory, before that sentence concerning that crime (heresy) was promulgated by the bishop of the place, or some other ecclesiastical person who has power concerning this."^{*}

Thus the canon law takes care that the spiritual sword should provide plunder for the temporal sword, in order that the temporal sword, for the sake of plunder, should support the spiritual sword.

If this canon law should come to be admitted in Ireland, and the temporal sword should come to be exercised "at the nod" of Dr. Cullen, the Pope's legate, we fear the CATHOLIC LAYMAN would be cut to pieces with two swords; and we suppose its types and printing-presses would be confiscated and seized. It is, however, a great comfort to us to think that the *Tablet*, *Nation*, and *Freeman's Journal* would certainly share the same fate; for surely Dr. Cullen gave a significant "nod" when he excluded those three newspapers from the "Young Men's Catholic Association." We do not say this as wishing that those papers should be suppressed, or that freedom of discussion on their side should be prevented; we say it only as consoling ourselves with the assurance that Irish Roman Catholics, who now enjoy liberty under a Protestant government, would join heartily with Protestants in saying that the Bishop of Rome should not be allowed to introduce his canon law into Ireland, or to bring the temporal sword into subjection to the spiritual sword—not even though the Pope should decree, as he has decreed, that this is the true sense of Scripture, and necessary to salvation.

But, then, we ask Roman Catholics to consider that

in that case they could not any longer assert that the Pope is infallible in giving the true sense of Scripture, as necessary to salvation; and we further warn them that the real purpose of making Cardinal Wiseman the Pope's legate in England, and Dr. Cullen the Pope's legate in Ireland, is to prepare, as far as possible, for introducing the Pope's canon law into these countries.

ASCENSION DAY.

We are indebted to the kindness of a friend for the following report of a Sermon preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, by the Rev. George Salmon, F.T.C.D., on the 21st May, 1857 (Ascension Day). We are sure it will be acceptable to a large number of our readers.

HEBREWS 10-12.

"But this Man after He had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God."

The Old Dispensation was not without a foreshadowing of the event which we celebrate to-day. That prophet, who in his converse with the world, embodied the spirit and power of the forerunner of our Lord, prefigured our Lord Himself in the manner of His triumphant departure from the world. Accordingly, one of the chapters to be read in the service for this evening records how there appeared a chariot of fire and horses of fire, which parted asunder the prophet and his disciple, and how Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven. Yet, it is impossible not to be struck with the fact that the tone in which the narrative is related is one of sadness, not of triumph. The sense of the loss which those whom he left behind on earth must sustain is too overpowering to allow them to rejoice in the glory bestowed on their master. The prophets to whom Elijah's removal from the world had been revealed announce the event as a message of bereavement. Elisha, saddened by his own knowledge of his approaching loss, stills, with impatience, the sounds which importunately echo from the lips of one band of prophets after another. "Knowest thou that the Lord will take away thy master from thy head to-day? Yea, I know it. Hold ye your peace." And when these predictions had found their accomplishment, and the chariot of fire had caught away his master from the gaze of Elisha, so that he saw him no more, the sense of bereavement was his one overpowering feeling. He took hold of his own clothes and rent them in two pieces. Not so, when the cloud received the ascending Saviour out of the sight of His disciples. They worshipped Him and returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God. We have here an indirect confirmation of the sufficiency of those "infallible proofs" by which the truth of our Lord's resurrection was established. Some forty days before, when He had told them of His speedy return to His Father, they, too, had no thought for anything but their own bereavement. In vain did He remind them that, if they loved Him they would rejoice because He had said He went unto the Father. Still, the fact was, that because He had said these things unto them sorrow had filled their hearts. And when His words had found their accomplishment in that first temporary withdrawal of His presence, no words can describe the gloom into which they were plunged by the eclipse of the Sun of their life. What words can paint the feelings of those who had come together to the sight of that cross of shame as they beat their breasts and returned. Many trials has the Church had since to suffer; but never such as that when faith itself appeared crushed, and hope became extinct, and the promises of God had seemed to fail, and His prophecies had been seen all converging to their fulfilment, and then suddenly seemed to mock them by miserable failure. All these clouds of doubt and sadness were rolled away, never to return, on the resurrection morn. So long did the risen Saviour continue on earth until every timorous scruple had been removed, and until they who for a time had doubted no longer hesitated to recognise in Him their Lord and their God. When, then, at length, He withdrew His presence, it was from men whose faith had been strengthened, and whose love had been confirmed so that they could show that love by rejoicing in His exaltation. They were no longer perplexed by uncertainties, whither their Lord had gone from them. They needed not to send men to search whether peradventure the Spirit of the Lord had taken their Master up and cast Him upon some mountain or into some valley. They knew He was but fulfilling His own promise to go to prepare a place for them, that where He was there they might be also. Their joy, then, in the glory of their Head was not dimmed by any solicitude for themselves. He had told them that it was expedient for them that He should go away: and so, in fact, it proved. The mantle of the ascending Elijah again falls on them who stand gazing after Him up to heaven. The risen Lord ascending upon high obtains gifts for men; even the presence of that Blessed Comforter who was to abide with the Church for ever. The great joy, then, with which the Apostles celebrated the ascension of their Lord, while still but rejoicing in His glory, and as yet scarcely knowing what blessings that ascension was to draw down upon themselves—that great joy has ever been renewed when the Church with clearer light and fuller knowledge turns back to contemplate the same event. None of her feasts is more deeply imbued with the spirit of holy joy. With joy the cycle of her feasts began. The sounds of earthly mirth chimed in with and almost overpowered her songs

of gladness as she led us to the manger of Bethlehem, and made us see the shepherds offering their devotions and the wise men presenting their gifts, and made us hear the anthems of the heavenly host ascribing glory to God on earth peace, good will toward men. But soon that joy was clouded over. We have been but tracing, under the Church's guidance, the earthly life of Him who was a man of sorrows; and so with Him we, too, must descend into the valley of humiliation. We have followed Him to the scene of His fasting and mysterious temptation: we have seen Him bear the contradiction of sinners and the rejection of those that He came to save. Finally, we have stood around His cross, and with wondering and sorrowing hearts been spectators of that the greatest proof of love that man can display, the giving his life for his friends. And then, again, a season of joy commenced when the grave could not hold its prey, and He whom death had no power to retain overcame death and burst the portals of the tomb. And now we have reached the goal. The days of suffering are over. We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour, and in His human nature exalted far above all heavens and raised to the right hand of God, angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto Him. What though it be not now as in that merry Christmas time when all the world seemed ready to echo the Church's hymns of gladness—though now her joys are those in which strangers intermeddle not, and this day the tide of the world's business rolls on regardless of her strains of triumph. Still the grounds for triumph are not the less real. This day our common nature has, in the person of the great Head of the Church, been raised to the highest throne in the universe. Now, as the Apostle tells us, hath God not only raised Christ from the dead, but set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world but also in that which is to come, and hath put all things under His feet, and given Him to be the head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.

We can see now with what reason it is that our own Church has placed the Ascension so high in the rank of the festivals which she celebrates with most honour. It is one of the four festivals for which proper Psalms are appointed; the other three being Christmas Day, Easter, and Whit Sunday. And it is one of the five for which proper prefaces are appointed in the Communion Service, Trinity Sunday being the fifth in addition to those already mentioned. Bear with me while I dwell a little on this point, and show how completely we are justified in the prominence which we give to this festival by the rank which it has ever held in the Church from the very earliest times. The tracing the history of the feasts of the Church is not a piece of idle antiquarian research. It is intimately connected with the history of doctrine. Could we know at any period of the Church's history what were the facts which she loved best to recal to memory—what the anniversaries which she loved best to celebrate—we should have a key to the knowledge of the whole of her habits of thought and feeling; for dogma has always been quick to find liturgical and ritual forms of expression, and the truths which have been most pondered on, and which have sunk the deepest to the Church's heart, are those also which she will recal most frequently in her services, and celebrate most fondly in her commemorations. Nor is it only this; but these commemorative observances react again upon dogma, and give prominence and permanence to the doctrines which have been celebrated in this way. Perhaps there can be no better illustration of this reaction of ritualism upon dogma than the history of the last new article which the Roman communion have added to their faith: For it was not that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception gave rise to the festival in honour of that event, but precisely the reverse. The origin of the festival was, that certain persons observing that we celebrate not only the feast of our Lord's Nativity, but also that of his Conception, thought that it would be becoming to celebrate not only the day of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary, as was usual at the time, but also the day of her Conception. And at a time when the great number thought it a mark of piety to assimilate in every possible way the honours paid to the Blessed Virgin and the honours paid to her Son, the idea found general acceptance. But St. Bernard and others objected to this then novel feast of the Conception of the Blessed Virgin, that the Church only celebrated in her feasts things that are holy, and that to celebrate the conception of one who was conceived in sin like others was to violate this rule, and to honour with the Church's celebrations what was sinful and impure. The force of the objection being acknowledged, and yet the observance of the feast spreading notwithstanding, and becoming general, it was not unnatural that the number should constantly increase of those who repudiated the objection by boldly maintaining that that conception which they saw their Church commemorate with such honour could not be sinful or unclean; and so the festival of the Conception of the Virgin Mary, which appears to have been instituted without the least anticipation of the consequences to which it led, developed itself naturally and almost inevitably into the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception which we have lately seen formally adopted by the Roman Catholic

^{*} Inhibemus quonque, ne cuq; iam laice pers. &c. liceat publice vel privatim de fide Catholica disputare. Qui vero contra fecerit, excommunicationis laquei innotetur.—Decree of Pope Alexander IV., Sext. lib. vi., tit. li., c. 2.

^{*} Bona hereticorum, qui gravius, horribiliter, ac detestabiliter quam predicti delinquant, ipsorum de fratribus nostrorum consilio decretum confiscata: et confiscationis tamen huiusmodi executioni, vel bonorum ipsorum occupatio fieri non debet per principes aut alios dominos temporales iuxta Gregorij, Papae predecessoris nostri, declarationem, aucte quam per episcopum loci, vel aliam personam ecclesiasticam, cum super hoc habuerit potestatem, sententia super eodem crimine fuerit promulgata.—Decree of Pope Boniface VIII., xxi. lib. vi., Tit. li., c. 19.

Church. And, reciprocally, the best proof of the novelty of the doctrine is the novelty of the feast. If the doctrine were true it would follow that the commencement of the Gospel, the first step in the work of our salvation, was not as St. Matthew begins the wondrous tale, the announcement of the miraculous incarnation to the Virgin espoused, nor yet, as St. Luke traces it a little further back, the setting apart for his work him who was to be the forerunner of our Lord, but that the necessary foundation had been laid in miracle long years before in exempting from the plague spot of the human race one alone of those naturally engendered of Adam. If this, which has been so strangely omitted by our sacred writers, had been known to the Church by tradition, it is absolutely unaccountable that that Church, which has ever loved to dwell in glad hymns and joyful festival on the facts on which her faith reposes, should for 1100 years never have thought of commemorating this fundamental truth, which would be, in order of time, the first of all the miracles on which our salvation depends. So that, as I said, it requires no more than a knowledge of the novelty of the feast to disprove, without any further investigation, all pretence to antiquity for the dogma. I may seem to have digressed from my subject; but I shall not think I have wandered too far if I have impressed on you more forcibly how close the connection between the knowledge of the history of the Church's feasts and that of her doctrines; and if I have prepared you more readily to admit that it is not waste of time to show that the inferences which I shall presently draw, as to the teaching of our own Church, from the prominence which she gives to this festival of the Ascension, hold good equally to the teaching of that elder Church with whom it has held the same place from very early times. I shall first appeal to a very interesting letter of St. Augustine, in which that Father, in reply to questions which had been put to him, lays down the soundest doctrine as to the proper conduct of Christians with respect to matters of ceremonial observance. He teaches the absolute indifference of these things in themselves, shows that it is unnecessary that they should be in all places alike; that, on the contrary, they always have varied in different countries; and points out that it is the duty of a Christian coming to one place from another to conform in those indifferent matters to the custom of the Church to which he comes, and not to imagine that the rules of his own Church had some intrinsic superiority which made it right for the rest of the world to adopt them. He goes on to tell that the occasion on which his own mind had been cleared up and brought to see these questions in their true light was, his mother's arrival in Milan, when she was somewhat scandalized at finding that they did not observe the Saturday fast, usual at Rome, and was a little perplexed in consequence what she ought to do. To quiet her conscience, Augustine consulted the bishop, St. Ambrose, who gave him the rule which has passed into a proverb, of, when at Rome, doing as those at Rome do. "When I am at Rome," said he, "I scruple not to fast on the Sabbath as they do there; when I am here I do not fast. So likewise you, whatever Church you come to, observe the custom of the place, if you would neither give offence to others nor take offence from them." Now, Augustine contrasts with these customs, which varied from Church to Church, some which were universally observed without variation. First, there were the things commanded in Scripture. Our Lord, he says, did not institute a burdensome ceremonial code such as the Jewish, but joined his Church by Sacraments very few in number, and very easy of observance, such as Baptism and the Supper of our Lord. These, and whatever else is contained in Scripture, are observed everywhere. But, besides these, he tells us that there were other observances not written, but handed down, which were received universally. The instances he gives are, the commemoration of the passion of our Lord, of His resurrection, of His ascension, and of the gift of the Holy Ghost. And he thinks it reasonable to conclude that amid such variety in other matters, Churches so widely separated in place could not all agree in the observance of these unless they had been originally instituted either by the Apostles themselves or by plenary councils of acknowledged universal authority. The result, you see, then, is that in the time of St. Augustine the festival of the Ascension stands out as one of the great commemorative festivals in which all Christians agreed, even though they differed in much besides, and which appeared then of such remote antiquity that it seemed not impossible that it might be referred back to apostolical times. I have delayed too long on this passage to leave myself time to do more than allude to a homily of St. Chrysostom's, delivered on the same festival, but will go back to the so-called Apostolic Constitutions, which were probably written a century earlier than St. Augustine's time, and which, if not evidence as to the usages of the apostles' age, at least give us trustworthy information as to what, at the end of the third century, those usages were thought likely to have been. Now, the festivals which in that work the Apostles are represented as enjoining are, in addition to the great Easter week, Christmas day, the Epiphany, observed in honour of the baptism of our Lord, Pentecost, and the Ascension, because it was the completion of our Saviour's economy on earth, *τὸ πέρας τῆς κατὰ χριστὸν οἰκονομίας*.

Then came to an end that Dispensation when the Church was ruled by the visible presence on earth of its great Head; and room was left for the introduction of that New

Dispensation which ten days hence we commemorate, in which, sitting at the right hand of God, He rules us, not showing Himself in visible bodily presence amongst us, but dwelling with us not less really by His Holy Spirit. But of that series of feasts which the Church devotes to the manhood of Christ, following with contemplative devotion the blessed steps of His most holy life on earth, of that series of feasts this is the end and the completion, now that we have seen His human body solemnly and publicly withdrawn from earth and set down on the right hand of the majesty on high.

I have dwelt on the perfect agreement of this, one of the most ancient monuments of early ritualism, with the teaching of our own Church in the place which it assigns to the festival of the Ascension, because this very point has been made a ground of objection against our Church by one of the more distinguished of those who some years since left her communion for the Church of Rome. And to judge from the representations of the writer to whom I allude, this festival occupies a far less prominent place in the devotional system of the Church of Rome than it does in ours. He says: "The heretical habit of mind is to rest on the Ascension as an end, a limit, a barrier, a completion. Persons brought up in heresy, when they betake themselves to Catholic theology, are often disappointed at the little stress laid upon the Ascension, and are, for the moment, chilled by the doctrine of St. Thomas, that it added nothing to our Lord, and conferred upon His sacred humanity nothing more than 'decency of place.' The Catholic habit of mind, which regards our Lord, and the Church, and the sacraments as always living, and energizing, and going on, not as historical facts or dramas that are past, does not rest upon the Ascension, but goes on to Corpus Christi, the Feast of Jesus present." I shall not stop to inquire whether a member of our Church is forced to disagree with the statement, properly understood, of Thomas Aquinas, that our Lord's human nature, even before the Ascension, wanted nothing belonging to the essence of its glory; nor shall I inquire whether the Church of Rome does lay, in reality, as little stress on the Ascension as the extract I quoted would seem to indicate. One would certainly not conclude this from her offices. But these offices, of course, can only indicate the relative importance ascribed to different subjects in the minds of those who composed them some hundreds of years ago, and can by no means be taken to represent the feelings of members of that Church in the present day. And of this last, the writer whom I have cited is a perfectly fair witness, who is fully entitled to speak. And he does appear to be quite right as to the place which his system would properly assign to the Ascension. If the doctrine of the Church of Rome be right, then the Church of England is wrong, and the ancient Church is wrong. Corpus Christi, and not the Ascension, is *τὸ πέρας τῆς κατὰ χριστὸν οἰκονομίας*. A full conviction of the perfect truth of our Lord's human nature is our best safeguard against many of the attempts which have been made to destroy the simplicity of our faith. If we are once led to imagine that our Lord's humanity was something utterly unlike ours, He ceases to inspire us with confidence in Him as a mediator, and we naturally, and almost necessarily, are driven to search for other mediators really and entirely in our own nature, who, we can be confident, will be ready to sympathise with our infirmities, and by whom we may have access to Him. And the perfect truth of Christ's human nature is the weapon, relying on which our Church makes her faith in the doctrine of the Ascension an answer to the scholastic subtleties with which the doctrine of the Eucharist has been perplexed. The natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and therefore not here. If it could be both here and there His nature could not be human nature. The nature of His body must be utterly unlike ours. If our Church be mistaken in this, the dignity of the festival of the Ascension sinks at once. We no longer commemorate the solemn withdrawal of our Lord's bodily presence from earth and its elevation to the courts of heaven: we but recall to memory a splendid vision, in which that body appeared, indeed, to be removed from earth, though in reality it remained there, and has perpetually since dwelt on earth in thousands of tabernacles made with hands. On this supposition His sacred body was not at the crucifixion subjected for the last time to the despite of men. It was not removed on this day far above the reach of human contumely and insult. It has remained since constantly in the hands of men even more helplessly than when standing beneath His cross; and though the faithful may do it reverence, yet thieves may carry it away, or the impious may mock it and trample it under their feet, or the carelessness of its protector may even allow the very animals to devour it. I scarcely like to state in words of mine the details of a hypothesis so revolting to our feelings to conceive, and prefer to do so in the words of the Roman Catholic writer whom I have already quoted:—"Was ever helplessness like His in the tabernacle? Was there ever captive cooped up in narrow cell as He in the little circular dungeon of the pyx? Was ever infirmity more complete? The bedridden patients of the hospital have more control over themselves than the King of Glory, whom love has caught in the meshes of the sacrament. He is our prisoner under lock and key, and we bring Him out when we will

to show Him to the assembled people that they may be certified that He has not escaped. For how many hours, night and day, and in how many sanctuaries, is a little star of unsteady light burning before Him, his only honour. Sometimes he must forego even that, lest thieves should come and steal Him—not for His beauty; oh, no, they will fling Him on the ground—but for the thirty pieces of silver that the vessel which contains Him may be worth." I need not pursue the quotation. Well, if all this be true, surely the marvel is not that He should have found for His human body "decency of place" by ascension into heaven, but that He should remain here, liable to be stolen by thieves or be flung by them on the ground. This last is the Church's highest mystery; this last is that which it ought to celebrate with its highest feast and its noblest anthem of rejoicing. It is perfectly true, as I said, that on this hypothesis three weeks hence, not to-day—Corpus Christi, not the Ascension, should be the culminating point of those feasts which are dedicated to the human nature of our Lord.

But the simple fact is, that from the beginning it has not been so. You see now the reason why, at the beginning, I very possibly may have wearied you by what may have seemed a needless parade of easily found authorities in proof of the antiquity of the festival of the Ascension, and of the high rank which it held in those days. I thought, as I said at first, that a knowledge of the feasts of the Church would afford an easy key to the knowledge of her doctrines. I wished to convince you that the habit of mind of the early Church was that which we are now told is heretical, to consider the Ascension as a barrier, a limit, a completion, *τὸ πέρας τῆς κατὰ χριστὸν οἰκονομίας*. I need say little to contrast with the antiquity of this festival the absolute novelty of the other. It is sufficient to remind you that its origin dates only from the middle of the thirteenth century, when it took its rise from the vision of a nun, who dreamed that she constantly saw in prayer the full moon with a breach in it, which she interpreted to mean the defect in the Church occasioned by the want of a festival in honour of the blessed sacrament. But it would be irrational to suppose that this dream of a crazy fanatic was the real cause of the institution of the festival. It mattered little by whom it was proposed. The proposal found acceptance then because the popular doctrine was such as to make the festival its proper expression; and if the idea had not been suggested by Juliana, it would have been by some one else. The festival was not before, because the doctrine was not the same.

But though we do rest on the Ascension as a limit, it is a calumny to say that we look on it as a mere historical fact or drama that is past; nay, it is but the commencement of that which now is, the exaltation of our risen Lord to the right hand of God, whence He bestows us His protection against all our enemies, where He ever liveth to make intercession for us. The Apostle saw in the ascension of Christ the most certain assurance that the sacrifice which He offered for us had been complete and effectual. His atonement does not, like the Jewish sacrifices, need constantly to be repeated. He does not stand in priestly attitude, repeating His own sacrifice, and offering up Himself again for the sins of the living and the dead. "Every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sin. But this Man, when He had offered one sacrifice for sin for ever, sat down on the right hand of God." His sacrificial work was done—our reconciliation was complete, and by His ascension He has given the surest pledge that where He, the Head, has gone, thither we, the members, should follow. It is not, then, as indifferent spectators that we contemplate the triumph of to-day. The triumph is ours. It is our own human nature which has been exalted, not only to heaven—not only to an equality with angels—but far above all heavens, higher than the highest angel, above all principalities and dominions, to the very throne of God Himself. And yet He shall come again, come again in like manner as He was seen going up into heaven. Once again heaven shall be open, and the angels of God ascend and descend upon the Son of man. The Lord Himself shall descend with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that obey not His Gospel; but to be glorified in His saints, and to be admired in all them that believe in Him. Brethren, since these things are so to be, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness? Ye who pray to be counted worthy of that calling and hope to dwell with Him for ever, fix on Him your gaze now; with heart and mind thither ascend, and there continually dwell. When on this day the heavens were opened, and the host of heaven, impatient to welcome their King, poured forth to meet Him, and the angels ascended and descended on the Son of man, they whose gaze was fixed on Him had no eye for any but Him; and while they knew it not, angels stood by them, and said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? Ought not this to be our attitude, brethren? Yet, can I say, why stand ye gazing up to heaven. Nay, rather, why grovel ye on the earth? Why are your hearts and souls bent down? Why your thoughts all engrossed by the concerns of this transitory scene? Why your affections riveted on the things of earth? This day, if ever, *sursum corda*, lift up your hearts unto the Lord.

Such is the frame of mind that is fitted for the feast

which is spread for you to day. To His table you are now invited. He not only calls on you with heart and mind to ascend to Him: He offers to dwell with you. It is true we do not believe that when He departed from us, it was only the sensible appearance of His body which was removed, or that now He mocks our senses by unsubstantial and delusive appearances. All that concerns us to know is, that we have the covenanted certainty of His union with the faithful communicant; that through this sacred ordinance He imparts Himself entire to us, and incorporates us with Him as His mystical members, and that "what merit, force, or virtue soever there is in His sacrificed body and blood we have it fully by this sacrament;" that through it our human nature is purified by union with His, our sinful bodies made clean by His body, our souls washed by His precious blood; we are enabled evermore to dwell in Him and He in us. May He give us hearts to desire these His precious promises. May He enable us to draw near unto Him with faith, and by faith find the fulfilment of them. May He, having enabled us to know Him here by faith, grant us the fruition of His glorious Godhead hereafter.—Amen.

ANCIENT LITURGIES—NO. III.

THE LITURGY OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM.

It is not our intention to give the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom at any length. It is admitted that the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom was, in substance, the Liturgy of St. Basil, adopted in the Church of Constantinople by St. Chrysostom, about thirty years after the time of St. Basil, that is, about the year 400. St. Chrysostom may probably have made some lesser modifications in it, but the substance was the same. But when Constantinople became the first Patriarchate of the east, the Churches which adopted her Liturgy spoke of it as St. Chrysostom's rather than St. Basil's. We need not, therefore, go over the same ground again in considering what was in fact the same Liturgy under another name.

But the mention of St. Chrysostom's Liturgy leads us to the proof of a fact which we rather assumed when speaking of St. Basil's Liturgy, and which we have now to prove.

We then assumed and asserted that the word *Θεοτοκος* (*Theotokos*), which occurs three times in the modern copies of St. Chrysostom's communion service, and twice in the modern Greek copies of St. Basil's, did not once occur in the original communion service of St. Basil or St. Chrysostom.

It will appear from an article in our present number that we do not make this assertion out of any dislike to what the word "*Theotokos*" was originally intended to express. We here point out this fact simply as a proof to what an extent the modern copies of those Liturgies have been interpolated, and as a means of detecting interpolated passages.

The original documents connected with the Nestorian controversy afford conclusive evidence that in the year 431, when the Council of Ephesus was held, the word *Theotokos* did not occur in the Liturgy of the Church of Constantinople. That was not 30 years after the time of St. Chrysostom. And as no charge was ever made against Nestorius, the heretical Archbishop of Constantinople in that year, of having put this word out of the Liturgy of his Church, we conclude that the word *Theotokos* was not in that Liturgy in St. Chrysostom's time. And that leads us to the further conclusion that the word was not in the Liturgy of St. Basil, for St. Chrysostom in adopting that Liturgy would probably not have omitted the word if he had found it there.

We will now produce the documents on which this argument is founded, taken from the history and proceedings of the Council of Ephesus, in the Concilia Generalia of Labbe and Cossart, vol. iii, p. 10, &c. (Ed. Paris, 1671.)

The sermon of Proclus^a was preached in the Church of Constantinople, in the presence of Nestorius, in vindication of the title "*Theotokos*," which Nestorius denied to be applicable to the Blessed Virgin. This sermon nowhere appeals to the fact that this term was, or had ever been, applied to the Blessed Virgin in the Liturgy of that very Church of Constantinople. The preacher, of course, would have used such an argument if he could. The fact that he did not use it is conclusive that the word "*Theotokos*" was not then applied to the blessed Virgin in the Liturgy of the Church of Constantinople.

But Proclus, urging as he did the applicability of the term, was careful to mark its true force and limitation:—"We do not preach a man deified, but we confess God incarnate, who inscribed His own handmaiden as His mother—He, who according to His being was without mother, and according to the dispensation on earth, without father."^b

In the book which St. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, wrote to the empresses on this question,^c he undertakes to show that older fathers called the Virgin "*Theotokos*." He quotes Athanasius as calling her so; he quotes Atticus, who was Bishop of Constantinople not long after the time of Chrysostom, but who did not call the Virgin

"*Theotokos*," but only maintains that "the Word was made flesh."

He quotes the Bishop of Antioch, who calls her "*Theotokos*;" also Amphilochius, of Iconium, who does not call her "*Theotokos*," but says that he who was born was God; also, Ammon, Bishop of Adrianople, who calls her "*Theotokos*."

St. Cyril then quotes from St. Chrysostom a passage which affirms that the Son is God, but does not call the Virgin "*Theotokos*." Now, considering that the question arose in that very Church in which the name of Chrysostom was so great, and the Liturgy of which Chrysostom had himself settled, St. Cyril would surely have quoted the word "*Theotokos*" from that liturgy if the word had been in it.

Again, in the epistle which St. Cyril wrote to Nestorius, who, as we have said, was Bishop of Constantinople, to persuade him to use the word "*Theotokos*," he does not appeal to the fact that the word was in the public Liturgy of Nestorius's own Church, which assuredly St. Cyril would have noticed if the fact were so.^d

In his second letter to Nestorius, in which St. Cyril appeals to the Fathers for the use of the word, he is equally silent as to the Liturgy of Constantinople.^e

In another letter^f St. Cyril complains that in the Church of Constantinople itself, Dorotheus, in presence of Nestorius, had pronounced anathema on any one who used the word *Θεοτοκος*, and that, notwithstanding, Nestorius had admitted him then and there to the communion. St. Cyril again appeals to the fact that the Fathers used the word. It surely would have been to the point to say, if it could have been said, that the word was in that very communion service which Nestorius and Dorotheus were then celebrating.

Again, in the letter which St. Cyril wrote to the clergy of Constantinople in support of the word *Theotokos*, he is still silent as to that word being in their own Liturgy.^g

In the letter of St. Cyril to Celestine, Bishop of Rome,^h about the aforesaid sermon of Dorotheus, there is the same appeal to the Fathers for the use of the word *Theotokos*, and the same silence as to the Liturgy of Constantinople.

The letters of Celestine to Nestorius and the clergy of Constantinople are equally silent upon the word being in their Liturgy.ⁱ

The complaint of the clergy of Constantinople to the Emperor^j against Nestorius for his proceedings against those who used the word *Theotokos*, does not justify them by appealing to the fact that the word was in the Liturgy of their Church.

A number of other documents might be produced in which we might well expect to find some reference to the word *Theotokos*, if it had been in the Liturgy of Constantinople at that time; yet no document ever alludes to that word being there. We are, therefore, warranted in concluding that there was no such word in that Liturgy at that time.

If Nestorius had struck that word out of the Liturgy, which he surely would have done if it had been there, we should, no doubt, have heard that fact alleged against him again and again. Yet he is never accused of having done so, and therefore we conclude that the word *Θεοτοκος* was not in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom; and if not in his, it was not in the Liturgy of St. Basil.

We will now proceed to notice the three passages of the modern copy of St. Chrysostom's communion service (from the dismissal of the catechumens to the end), in which the word *Theotokos* is found; that our readers may see what sort of passages bear on the face of them this mark of being interpolated; and it will also be seen that in each case there is other and independent evidence that those passages are really interpolations.

I. "Celebrating the memory of our all holy, undefiled, blessed-above-all, and glorious Lady *Theotokos*, the ever Virgin Mary, with all the saints, we commend ourselves and each other, and all our life, to Christ the God."—(Goar, *Rituale Græcorum*, p. 74. Ed. Paris, 1647.)

This passage is not in the Barberini M.S., which is the oldest Greek copy of St. Chrysostom's Liturgy (p. 99). This shows the passage to have been added after the tenth century.

The passage also occurs before that part of the modern "*Liturgy of St. Chrysostom*" which corresponds with the genuine commencement of St. Basil's Liturgy, as ascertained in our last.

Thus the word *Theotokos* in this passage corresponds with other proofs of interpolation.

II. Again, in Goar, p. 78, we find in the modern Liturgy, called St. Chrysostom's, the following passage:—"We further offer to Thee this reasonable service, for those who have rested in the faith, for those before the fathers, for the fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, the continent, and every spirit made perfect in faith; especially for our all-holy, undefiled, blessed-above-all, and glorious Lady *Theotokos*, and ever Virgin Mary."

We have shown in our last that there was no such passage in the original and genuine Liturgy of St. Basil, which Chrysostom adopted and followed. Here too, therefore, the word *Theotokos* concurs with other evidences of interpolation.

III. Again, at p. 84:—"Direct our way, confirm us in thy fear, guard our life, preserve our steps, at the prayers and intercession of the glorious *Theotokos*, and ever Virgin Mary, and all the saints."

We have shown in our last that a similar passage was introduced in the Liturgy of St. Basil after the Syriac translation of that Liturgy was made, being found only in the Syriac copy. We may, therefore, be certain that this passage was not in the genuine Liturgy of St. Chrysostom. So here, too, the word *Theotokos* concurs with other evidence of interpolation.

Thus, in all the places where the term *Theotokos* is now found in the modern so-called Liturgy of St. Chrysostom (from the dismissal of the catechumens to the end), we have other independent proof that those passages are interpolations. That independent proof is strikingly confirmed by the evidence of the documents we have referred to, relating to the Nestorian controversy, which show that the word *Theotokos* was not in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom in the year 431.

Thus it ever is; when the evidence is closely examined, whatever goes direct to magnify God the Son—whatever goes direct to prove that God the Son was made man—that He who was born of the Blessed Virgin was both God and man: all that can be traced up to the preaching of the Apostles themselves. But whatever goes to magnify Mary as an intercessor—a saviour, the proof of that always stops short in the inventions and interpolations of late and corrupted ages.

We think our examination of ancient Liturgies has not been in vain, if it has done no more than lead us to this result.

We have been unwilling to fatigue our readers with the multitude of instances we might produce of the manner in which the ancient Liturgies have been corrupted in later times, but we may hereafter return to the subject, in order to examine briefly the ROMAN LITURGY.

Θεοτόκος, DEIPARA, MOTHER OF GOD.

WE wish to know, once for all, and to have it settled in our readers' minds, whether Roman Catholics are right or wrong in styling the Blessed Virgin, "Mother of God."

We cordially confess and fully believe that He whom she bore is "God of the substance of the Father, begotten before the world, and man of the substance of His mother, born in the world;" and in that faith we hope to die, and to meet Him at His coming. But the question is, if this be not enough; or if it be necessary for true Catholics further to give to HER that service and duty and obedience which some Roman Catholics tell us that God Himself must owe and render to His own Mother.

The question is not at all concerning *Him*, her Son; it is concerning *her* only, whether SHE, as mother of God, is a joint partaker of the worship and service which we owe to God.

This question is becoming daily more and more the turning point and distinguishing characteristic of opposite religious systems, and we are resolved, once for all, to try to settle our own minds and those of our readers concerning it.

The only argument we have ever heard for calling the Virgin "Mother of God" is this:—that the General Council of Ephesus, acknowledged as a "general council" by the Church of England and Ireland, and by Protestants generally, decreed that all Christians should call the Blessed Virgin "Mother of God," and should give to her all that was due to her in that capacity; and that, therefore, all who acknowledge "the first four general councils," as we do,^a have the same authority for this as for the articles of the faith contained in the Nicene creed.

The CATHOLIC LAYMAN was established to test such assertions by original authorities. In this way we will deal with the question; and we invite the attention of all who, like ourselves, are in earnest in seeking for truth and knowledge in those things which lie at the root of their religion.

We approach this subject without passion or prejudice.

Many of the Greek Fathers called the Blessed Virgin *Θεοτόκος*; many of the Latin Fathers called her "*Deipara*." We have no dislike to either of these terms, save that they are sought to be perverted, and we should be quite willing to use either or both of them in the same sense in which the Greek and Latin Fathers in old times used them.

But, after carefully examining the facts and the evidence, we affirm—

I. That "Mother of God" is not the true or proper English translation of *Θεοτόκος* or "*Deipara*."

II. That though individual bishops may have used the word at and before the Council of Ephesus, that general

^a Our readers will not suppose that we are here admitting that even a general council is infallible. On the contrary, we strictly hold to the 21st article of the Church of England, which, treating of the authority of general councils, says—"Forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all are not governed with the Spirit and Word of God, they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Whereupon things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture." But we find that the faith defined by those four Councils is no other than the faith of Holy Scripture; and we take this as proof that the Church of Christ is founded on the Rock of Faith and that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her."

^b Οὐκ ἀνθρώπον ἐποθεῖν ἐκρήτομεν, ἀλλὰ Θεὸν σαρκωθέντα ὑμολογοῦμεν. τὴν οἰκίαν δούλην ἐπεγράψατο μητέρα, ὁ καθ' οὐσίαν ἀμήτωρ, καὶ καθ' οἰκονομίαν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀμήτωρ.

^c P. 106

^d Cap. vi., p. 313.

^e Cap. II., p. 316-321.

^f Cap. x., p. 324.

^g Cap. xii., p. 332.

^h Cap. xiv., p. 340.

ⁱ Cap. xviii., p. 353.

^j Cap. xix., p. 361.

Cap. xxx., 425.